UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/607,895	06/27/2003	Barrett M. Kreiner	BELL-0193/02242	7209

45695 7590 03/12/2007
WITHERS & KEYS FOR BELL SOUTH
P. O. BOX 71355
MARIETTA, GA 30007-1355

EXAMINER	
VU, TUAN A	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2193	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/12/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/607,895	KREINER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tuan A. Vu	2193	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *03 January 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-10,12 and 20-27* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-10,12 and 20-27* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *03 January 2007* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the Applicant's response filed 1/03/07.

As indicated in Applicant's response, claims 1, 12, 20-21, 26 have been amended, and claims 11, 13-19 canceled. Claims 1-10, 12, 20-27 are pending in the office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1-10, 12, 21-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Specifically, the limitation recited as 'remotely, from the first computer, executing said second instruction ...on said second computer' as recited in claims 1, 21, 26 are not provided with appropriate support in the Specifications to enable one skilled in the art to be apprised of the limitation, and ascertain that the Inventor has possession thereof when the Application was filed. The claims recite that the translated second instruction within the second operating system is compatible with this operating system of the second computer. The specifications do not provide a single part for describing how the remote first computer can execute another set of instructions perceived as native to the second computer. The Disclosure explains that the output from executing the translated instructions at the second computer can be redirected back to the first

computer for viewing but this is not same as executing from a distance native code inside another computer. It is deemed that most remote procedure calls have to fall under a communication scheme between the calling computer (caller) and the called computer (callee) whereby data are passed between the two systems in form of stub, messaging or meta-information leading to native code execution in the operating system being called (or initiating the remote procedure calling). It is known that via indirect support of communication and passing that data can be retrieved (or remotely accessed), code can be formed to effectuate data access, and output passed back to the calling computer; and this normal paradigm is perceived from scanning the Specifications (see Drawings: Fig. 2-3). The above limitation is not enabling one skill in the art to construe that the inventor has possession of a way that enable the first calling computer to execute from distance the native method pertinent to the O.S. of the second computer. This limitation would bear little patentable weight, and for merits would be treated as a mere remote data access via the above communication paradigm. Paragraph 0044 of the Specification does not clearly teach execution invoked in a client machine to execute native code residing on the server machine; and the way data are accessed from a requesting client via communicating of special procedures (RPC, RMI, stub passing, SOAP) represents this very common concept to request data via a client (to access remote server data) invoking a remote procedure call; and invoking a call via a sequence of communication protocol steps cannot be same as invoking directly a native executable code stored and loaded inside the platform runtime executing the code.

Claims 2-10, 12, 22-25, and 27 are also rejected for failing to overcome the above lack of description impropriety of the base claim.

4. Claim 20 recites a second computing system having 'software which when executed on the first computing system is operable for identifying instructions compatible with ... second computer and incompatible ... first computer, the instructions relating to user inputs'. From the Specifications, there is no mention of a stored software on a second computer which 'when executed on the first computer' identifies instructions compatible with the second computer but incompatible with the first computer. Again, if the server were to translate XML non-proprietary format into instructions executable only on the server side and that the resulting output can be communicated and retranslated at the client end, as described in Drawing Fig. 3 of the Specifications, it is deemed that the Disclosure does not teach a second computer server having instructions thereon such that if executed at the client end (on the first computing system) would identify which instructions are compatible with the client and/or are not with the server. The disclosed second computer is to address the request from the client (or first computer) by retranslating output-related XML form into executable form compatible only at the 2nd computer (server) end, by means of which executable, data related to the client (first computer) request (for output) is communicated back for reconversion at the first computer (client); rendering the above limitation unfit with the Specification; and virtually new matter with respect to the disclosure as originally presented. The Inventor does not appear to possess this limitation at the time the invention was made, and this limitation will be given very little patentable weight. To assess on the merits of the claim, the above limitation would be treated as though the second computer stores instructions to identify instructions related to user inputs (or inputs received coming from the first computer), so that when translated in the second computer, those instructions would be compatible with the second computer but not the first computer.

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 20, 26 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 20 recites *a second computing system ... translating, utilizing a device driver in the operating system on the second computer system, the instructions into non-proprietary data defining an XML item, wherein the device driver formats the instructions into an XML element corresponding to the instructions, transmitting the data defining XML items corresponding to the instructions relating to user inputs.*

According to the USC § 112, 1st paragraph rejection analysis, the instructions (being identified by a stored *software* on the second computing system) are not disclosed as having sufficient description, because the recited 'software' (see para 4 of Office Action) being operable to identify the *instructions* – whether they are compatible (or not) with any computing system -- is not taught or deserving proper merits; nor are these very instructions reasonably taught or disclosed herein, by virtue of the above. One skilled in the art would not be apprised on the extent of the above limitation as the result from the lack of description as set forth in the USC § 112, 2nd para from above. The Specifications discloses input at keyboard can be translated at the second computer into XML form, which is communicated back to the client (Specifications - pg. 9, para 0026). But the *user inputs* (re: *a first computing system ... receiving XML items corresponding to user inputs for execution on the first computing system*) recited in claim 20 cannot be the same as the *user inputs* (line 14 of claim) at *the second computer system* as recited

(or based on the description at pg. 9 from the Disclosure). The limitation regarding the instructions in light of the XML item being translated and transmitted (re: *transmitting the data defining XML items* --Note: lack of antecedent basis on items -- *corresponding to the instructions relating to user inputs*) appear to be an unclear issue leading to much confusion, even after reading the Specifications. This limitation will be treated as the following: after conversion, data formatted at the second computer into XML form will be transmitted as inputs back into the client first computer.

Claim 26 recites 'the instructions relating to inputs being compatible with the first operating system on the first computer' (line 13) and this limitation does not provide sufficient antecedent basis for 'inputs' for one skill in the art to learn how instructions relating to outputs is now claimed as relating to inputs. This will be treated as 'outputs' pending Applicant's clarification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claims 1-10, 12, 20-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Salmenkaita et al., USPN: 2004/0176958 (hereinafter Salmenkaita).

As per claim 1, Salmenkaita discloses method for providing remote computer access on a second computer from a first computer over a network, comprising:

receiving a first instruction from a first operating system on the first computer for execution (e.g. *voice command* – Fig. 2A, 2D; receive voice command 282 – Fig. 4I; Fig 5A; user input *710*-Fig 7A, input *730* – Fig. 7B; Fig. 4C-4D), the first instruction being compatible with the first operating system and incompatible with a second operating system on the second computer (Note: wireless environment browser of portable wireless reads on first instruction of portable device incompatible with services environment of server – see Fig. 2A, 2B);

translating utilizing a device driver in the first operating system on the first computer the first instruction into non-proprietary data defining at least one XML item (e.g. *voice XML tags* - para 0052; *embed voice tags in a XML message* -- para 0056-0061, pg. 4-5; para 0172-0174, pg. 14), wherein the device driver formats the first instruction into at least one XML element corresponding to the first instruction (e.g. para 0172-0174; inference engine – para 0232);

transmitting the data defining at least one XML item from the first computer to the second computer (e.g. para 0085-0086, pg. 8; *Message 515*, *XML file 227* - Fig. 4C, D);

translating utilizing a device driver in the second operating system on the second computer, the data defining at least one XML item into a second instruction, wherein the device driver translates the at least one XML element corresponding to the first instruction into the second instruction (e.g. step 736 – Fig. 7B; para 0258, pg. 21), the second instruction being compatible (e.g. xml 227 - Fig. 4c, 4d; services 440, 442, 444, 446, 448, 450 method calls – Fig. 6; *invoke ...method ... metadata vector* – para 0258, pg. 21) with the second operating system on the second computer and incompatible with the first operating system on the first computer (Note: server with proprietary services to effect recommendations fulfilling applications to send back to client wireless reads on not compatible with native environment of wireless client – see

Fig. 5A); said second instruction corresponding to the first instruction for execution on the second computer (e.g. boxes 216, 240, 242, 244, 246 – Fig. 4D; para 0249, pg. 21; steps 364-366 Fig. 5A); and

remotely, from the first computer, executing said second instruction on said second computer(e.g. Fig 4D; para 0177, pg. 15; Fig. 4E; para 0225-0227, pg. 18; Fig. 5; *receive ... service 368* – Fig. 5A – Note: remotely executing treated as remotely requesting a application service with output communicated from server processing the request).

As per claims 2-3, Salmenkaita discloses said first instruction comprises receiving an instruction for outputting data or displaying data (e.g. display area 102B --Fig. 1; *recommended services* – Fig 2B-C; Figs. 3; *prepared updated MENU 224* – to device 100: *MENU message 509* – Fig. 4B, 4D – Note: selection by wireless user for a recommendation being serviced and updated by server for retransmission back to wireless client as updated recommendation MENU reads on instruction of data outputting).

As per claim 4, Salmenkaita discloses receiving an instruction for outputting data comprises receiving an instruction for generating a sound (e.g. *audio metadata 125'* – Fig. 4B; *audio output* - para 0085, pg. 8).

As per claims 5 and 7, Salmenkaita discloses receiving said first instruction comprises receiving an instruction for inputting data; an instruction indicationg a computer keyboard input (Fig. 1).

As per claim 6, Salmenkaita discloses input via a touch pad, the use of touchpad in some small device to provide mouse functionality was equivalent to a mouse click (touch pad as in *Touch sensor* - para 0072, pg. 6; Fig. 1).

As per claim 8, Salmenkaita discloses generating a first XML tag defining the beginning of an XML item, generating a data item corresponding to the first instruction, generating a second XML tag defining the end of an XML item (e.g. Table D, E, pg. 14; para 0155, pg. 11; *processing instruction* – para 0163-0164, pg. 12).

As per claim 9, Salmenkaita discloses transmitting the data using HTTP (e.g. Fig. 6, para 0179, pg. 15; para 0266-0271, pg. 22; Fig. 3D).

As per claim 10, Salmenkaita discloses translating the data into a second instruction comprises identifying a first XML tag defining the beginning of an XML item, identifying a data item corresponding to an instruction, identifying a second XML tag defining the end of an XML item (para 0232, pg. 19; *specification ... activity* – para 0156, pg. 11; para 0163-0164, pg. 12).

As per claim 12, Salmenkaita discloses a computer readable medium (refer to claim 1 for corresponding rejection) having computer-implementable instructions stored thereon for performing the method recited in claim 1.

As per claim 20, Salmenkaita discloses a system for remote computer access, comprising:

a first computing system having stored thereon software which when executed on the first computing system is operable (e.g. Fig. 4C) for identifying instructions compatible with an operating system on the first computing system, the instructions relating to generating system outputs (e.g. Fig. 4D; Fig. 7C); translating, utilizing a device driver in the operating system on the first computing system, the instructions into non-proprietary data defining an XML item, wherein the device driver formats the instructions into an XML element corresponding to the

instructions (e.g. *voice XML tags* -para 0052; *embed voice tags in a XML message* -- para 0056-0061, pg. 4-5; para 0172-0174);

transmitting the data defining an XML item corresponding to the instructions relating to generating system outputs (e.g. Fig. 4C) and receiving XML (e.g. Fig. 4D) items corresponding to user inputs for execution on the first computing system (e.g. para 0085-0086, pg. 8; *Message 515, XML file 227* - Fig. 4C, D – Note: transmitting by wireless device or first system -- Fig. 4C, 4E -- **reads on** receiving by the server or second system -- Fig. 4D, 4F);

a second computing system (e.g. Fig. 4D, 4F) having stored thereon software which when executed on the first computing system is operable for identifying instructions compatible with an operating system on the second computer system and incompatible with the operating system on the first computer system (Note: server with proprietary services to effect recommendations fulfilling applications or to retrieve output data to send back to client wireless reads on not compatible with native environment of wireless client – see Fig. 5A), the instructions relating to user inputs;

translating, utilizing a device driver in the operating system on the second computing system, *the instructions* (Note: instructions interpreted as format data parsed from request received from client system) into non-proprietary data defining an XML item, wherein the device driver formats the instructions into an XML element (e.g. *recommendations, XML messages* - pg. 13, para 0168-1070; steps 231, 244, 246, 248 –Fig. 4D – Note: refer to Claims USC 112, 2nd paragraph Rejection for limitation interpretation) corresponding to the instructions;

transmitting the data defining XML items corresponding to the instructions relating to user inputs (e.g. steps 231, 244, 246, 248 –Fig. 4D), and

receiving XML items corresponding to generating outputs from the first computing system for execution on the second computer system (e.g. boxes 216, 240, 242, 244, 246 – Fig. 4D; para 0249, pg. 21; steps 364-366 Fig. 5A) ; and

a communications network operably coupled between said first computing system and said second computing system for transmitting data between said first computing systems and said second computing system (Figs. 1-2).

As per claim 21, Salmenkaita discloses a method for providing remote computer access, comprising:

receiving instructions relating to generating output (e.g. *voice command* – Fig. 2A, 2D; receive voice command 282 – Fig. 4I; Fig 5A; user input *710*-Fig 7A, input *730* – Fig. 7B; Fig. 4C-4D) on a first computer from a first operating system on the first computer, the instructions being compatible with the first operating system and incompatible with a second operating system on a second computer;

creating data defining at least one XML item corresponding to the instructions relating to generating output, wherein the instructions are created into at least one XML element corresponding to the instructions (*voice XML tags* -para 0052*; embed voice tags in a XML message* -- para 0056-0061, pg. 4-5; para 0172-0174, pg. 14);

transmitting the data defining at least one XML item from the first computer to the second computer (e.g. Fig. 4C);

receiving data defining an XML item relating to inputs on the first computer from the second computer (e.g. steps 231, 244, 246, 248 –Fig. 4D);

creating instructions relating to inputs from the data defining an XML item relating to inputs, the instructions relating to inputs (step 736 – Fig. 7B; para 0258, pg. 21; Fig. 4c, 4d; services 440, 442, 444, 446, 448, 450 method calls – Fig. 6; *invoke ...method ... metadata vector* – para 0258, pg. 21) being compatible with the first operating system on the first computer and incompatible with the second operating system on the second computer (Note: server with proprietary services to effect recommendations fulfilling applications to send back to client wireless reads on not compatible with native environment of wireless client – see Fig. 5A); and

remotely, from the first computer, executing the instructions relating to inputs on the second computer (re claim 1).

As per claims 22-25, these claims correspond to claims 14-17, respectively; therefore will incorporate the corresponding rejection as set forth therein.

As per claim 26, Salmenkaita discloses a method for providing remote computer access, comprising:

receiving instructions relating to user inputs on a first computer from a first operating system on the first computer, the instructions being compatible with the first operating system and incompatible with a second operating system on a second computer;

creating data defining at least one XML item corresponding to the instructions relating to user inputs, wherein the instructions are created into at least one XML element corresponding to the instructions; transmitting the data defining at least one XML item from the first computer to the second computer;

all of which having been addressed in claim 1.

Salmenkaita further discloses

receiving data defining an XML item relating to outputs on the first computer from the second computer (*recommendations, XML messages* - pg. 13, para 0168-1070; steps 231, 244, 246, 248 –Fig. 4D);

creating instructions relating to outputs corresponding to the data defining an XML item relating to outputs, the instructions relating to inputs being compatible with the first operating system on the first computer and incompatible with the second operating system on the second computer (e.g. xml 227 - Fig. 4c, 4d; services 440, 442, 444, 446, 448, 450 method calls – Fig. 6; *invoke ...method ... metadata vector* – para 0258, pg. 21 -Note: server with proprietary services to effect recommendations fulfilling applications to send back to client wireless reads on not compatible with native environment of wireless client – see Fig. 5A); and

remotely, from the first computer, executing the instructions relating to outputs on the second computer (re claim 1).

As per claim 27, see Salmenkaita (e.g. Browser 102, Fig. 3B; Fig. 6, para 0179, pg. 15; para 0266-0271, pg. 22; Fig. 3D)

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 1/03/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Following are the Examiner's observations in regard thereto.

USC § 102(b) Rejection:

(A) Applicants have submitted that as amended claim 1 recites, inter alia, 'remotely, from the first computer, executing said second instruction' (Appl. Rmrks, pg. 12, top) and that Salmenkaita's voice XML tags (or voice short-cut) fail to disclose each and every feature of claim 1; particularly, the paradigm of 2 operating system wherein XML data received by a

second computer from a first is translated into compatible instructions to the second computer but not to the first computer (Appl. Rmks, pg. 12, middle to pg. 13, top). The *remotely executing* limitation is given very little patentable weight and has been treated based on a default broad interpretation and rationale as set forth in the USC 112, 1st paragraph rejection. The rejection has set forth explanatory Notes as to what is deemed compatible with respect to the wireless client and what is deemed incompatible therein versus what is solely and compatibly executable at the server system; and it is believed that the cited portions of Salmenkaita have fulfilled this paradigm of 2 computing systems (practically incompatible, in terms of executable platforms) wherein incompatibility of code application and data realization has lead to the use of non-proprietary XML format in order to remotely access data via execution of code pertinent to each such system. The very teaching of the instant Application about using XML is sufficient evidence that by using XML the compatibility of platforms would be resolved via communication of XML metadata. And W3C-based methodologies have been applied extensively in known network technologies at the time the invention was made; one of which herein evidenced by Salmenkaita with transmission of XML tags describing a wireless user's request. That is, the compatibility issue of client code and server code has been exhibited via the use of a neutral XML format being very portable and substantially extensible to enable description of request or meta-specifying task to be performed by one platform but requested from another platform. Absent any specificity about how the compatibility issue as claimed has been implemented (e.g. how the data format as in the request on a client is implemented so as to render them necessarily incompatible if transmitted to a server --directly without XML reconverting-- is not specified in the claim) from the claim language in order to distinguish it

from Salmenkaita's formulating of user's input into XML tags, said compatibility (of code respective to a client or a server) limitation has been interpreted from the entirety of the claimed features, and that amounts to usage of W3 markup language to communicate a remotely initiated request for data. Therefore, Salmenkaita's use of XML to embody metadata carrier and to enable data access or retrieval to support the wireless network requests anticipates the claim as set forth in the Rejection. The above argument is deemed non-persuasive. Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

The claims will stand rejected as set forth in the Office Action.

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan A Vu whose telephone number is (272) 272-3735. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM-4:30PM/Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571)272-3756.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-3735 (for non-official correspondence - please consult Examiner before using) or 571-273-8300 (for official correspondence) or redirected to customer service at 571-272-3609.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tuan A Vu
Patent Examiner,
Art Unit 2193
March 06, 2007